DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 615 EA 021 115

AUTHOR Elmaleh, Haim
TITLE Causal Factors for Termination of Jewish Day School Principals.
PUB DATE Feb 89
NOTE 29p.; For related documents, see EA 021 114-117. Small print in tables may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; *Competence; *Dismissal (Personnel); Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; Occupational Mobility; *Principals; *Private Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Jewish Day Schools

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the causal factors for termination among Jewish day school principals in the United States, the rate of termination, and its effect on the schools. Ten hypotheses were designed for the study. The instruments used in the survey were two self-designed questionnaires, one for school principals and the other for board presidents. The population consisted entirely of the principals and board presidents of 328 Jewish Day Schools (233 principals and 114 board presidents responded). According to both principals and board presidents, the four most important reasons for principal termination included relations with the board, career and advancement, competency, and financial reasons. Although no single variable seemed to be primarily responsible, each factor contributed to the total picture in which executive termination could readily occur. It appears that those principals who do not ignore the political realities of their educational environment and who take political steps to solve educational problems will become an integral part of the school system. (14 Tables and 14 References) (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308615

CAUSAL FACTORS FOR TERMINATION OF JEWISH DAY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

by

Haim Elmaleh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Haim Elmaleh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

February 1989

EA 021 115

CAUSAL FACTORS FOR TERMINATION OF
JEWISH DAY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the causal factors for termination among Jewish day school principals in the United States, the rate of termination, and its effect on the schools. Ten hypotheses were designed for the study. The instruments used in the survey were two self-designed questionnaires, one for school principals and the other for board presidents. The population consisted entirely of the principals and board presidents of 328 Jewish day schools. There were 233 principals and 114 board presidents who responded to the questionnaires. A Statistical Analysis System was used on the survey data with the following procedures: frequency and crosstabulation, ANOVA, and the Scheffe Test for multiple comparisons.

The day school is a unique institution found to be special in Jewish communities and has proven to be a good training ground for future leadership. American Jewish leaders and educators regard the day school as the only American institution that can provide future leaders with strong educational and cultural background and a firm commitment to Judaism. The day school provides an intensive educational program with two curricula: Judaic studies, which include study of the Hebrew language and literature, Pentateuch, Prophets, Talmud, and Jewish history; and general studies which, in accordance with the standards established by the State Board of Education, employs the same tests and materials as those used in the public schools. The organization of the school as an educational institution is composed of several important components:

1. The board of directors is represented by lay leaders, members of the community, parents, and financial supporters. The board members and their president are the decision-makers, constitute policies, and are responsible for the overall functions of the constitution.
2. The education committee is responsible to the board of directors and consists of a chairperson, lay educators, the principal, rabbis, parents, and a representative of the teachers.
3. The principal is appointed by the board with the recommendations of the education committee. This

1. Younger principals will give less importance to personal reasons than older principals.
2. Principals from small schools will indicate:
   a. a more negative school climate
   b. more negative parent relations
   c. higher levels of job satisfaction than will principals from larger schools.
3. Non-local principals will indicate more negative relations with the community and with the board than will local principals.
4. Principals will give more importance to financial reasons, personal reasons, and job satisfaction than will the board presidents.

The study was limited to the problem as it relates to the principals serving the Jewish day schools in the United States during the school years of 1981-1986. Jewish day schools were defined in this research as schools that are accredited by the State Education Department and which offer a dual program, Judaic studies and general studies.

The problem with most of the studies is that termination rates are reported but the reasons are commonly neglected.

Castagna (1963) noted that "prospect of greater salary gains in a new position" had influenced principals to terminate their position. Lutz (1963) and Burlingame (1977), in interviews with short-tenure superintendents, found the following reasons for short turnover: community instability,

inadequate living conditions, inadequate community service, and undesirable personality traits in the superintendent. In a survey of board presidents and superintendents, Brause (1966) found agreement among 550 participants of his survey that allowing differences of opinion on critical issues to become personal was a paramount cause for dismissal (involuntary termination).

Graser (1972), in a study of superintendent turnover in New Jersey, stated several factors for involuntary termination: a lack of goodwill and confidence, making it impossible to do the job, school district political activity, personal values, and personal issues such as education, health, and age.

Bentley (1976), in his study of variables related to turnover of superintendents, reached the following conclusions: boards of education interfere in administrative affairs assigned to the superintendent, boards do not support the administrators or show confidence in their work, and pressure groups tend to overly influence policy making. Paolillo (1982), in a study of turnover among Missouri superintendents, reported on low salaries and on stress caused by pressure from teacher organizations. The superintendents also indicated that they had not been adequately prepared to deal with educational planning, program evaluation, performance appraisal, and instituting change.

Dawson (1983), in her study of factors related to the continuation and non-continuation of superintendents in

Virginia, stated the following reasons for termination: unsatisfactory board relations, health, avoidance of community conflict, and professional growth. Dalton (1984), in his study of superintendent turnover in North Carolina, found the following factors affecting turnover: relationship with the board, change in board philosophy, career change, early retirement, salary, dissatisfaction with the position, and relationship with the community.

Methodology

The population of this study consisted entirely of principals and presidents of Jewish day schools in the United States serving during the academic year of 1985-86.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this survey were two almost identical questionnaires, one for principals and one for presidents. These multiple-choice questionnaires were developed specifically to investigate factors related to the termination of the position of principals. The same factors were investigated in each questionnaire, with the addition of questions to the presidents' version of two areas of interest:

1. Principals' competency
2. Rate of termination.

Each questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A of the questionnaire was entitled "Reasons for Changing Previous Positions" and included eight major components. A

major component was composed of several statements that were presented as variables that had been identified through the literature as being related to the termination of the principalship. They were:

1. Personal reasons - 5 items
2. Financial reasons - 5 items
3. School climate - 10 items
4. Relations with board - 5 items
5. Community reasons - 5 items
6. Relations with parents - 5 items
7. Job satisfaction - 15 items
8. School effectiveness - two parts
    a. 15 variables related to the result of termination (appears on both questionnaires)
    b. 15 variables related to principals' competencies (appears only on presidents' questionnaire).

Fifteen variables related to principals' competencies were designed to provide information from the president of the board about former principals' competencies in their positions. The fifteen areas of competency were identified in the literature (Bentley, 1976) as being necessary for the principalship. The board presidents were asked to rate their former principals on each competency area and place a value on the importance of the item.

Section B of the questionnaire was entitled "Demographic Data" and included three secondary components. A secondary component was composed of several questions and was designed to

describe the personal characteristics of the principal and the president and to give information about the school. The demographic data were designed to provide the following:

1. Professional Background: Age of entry into each administrative position; administrative and teaching experience in the previous and present position; position assignment, locality, contract's termination, voluntary and involuntary termination, number of positions that were changed during the last five years, including future plans.
2. Present School Information: School organization, size, religious affiliation, and number of schools in the community.
3. Personal Background: Type of position held, sex, age, degrees, certificates earned, and religious affiliation.

The principals and board presidents were asked to rate each statement on 8-point scales as to the degree to which each variable had influenced the decision to leave a position. The scales ranged from as low as one (1) to as high as eight (8) and were also described by four categories: a=very little; b=some; c=quite a bit; and d=a very great deal.

Principals and board presidents were presented with a series of questions and asked to rate the importance of their reasons for leaving. These stated reasons were grouped into eight major components: personal reasons, financial factors,

school climate, relations with the board, community reasons, relations with parents, job satisfaction, and school effectiveness. Board presidents were also asked to rate the competency of the previous principal.

Six categories associated with principal termination were selected to be used as secondary components:

1. Teaching experience - prior to the administrative position
2. Administrative experience - prior to the administrative position:
   a. 0-1 years of experience
   b. 2-5 years of experience
   c. 6 or more years of experience
3. Size of the Jewish day school:
   a. Fewer than 50 students
   b. 51-100
   c. 101-150
   d. 151-200
   e. 201-250
   f. more than 250
4. Age of principal:
   a. 25 or under
   b. 26-35
   c. 36-45
   d. 46-55
   e. over 55

5. Local or outside origin: selected local principals compared to outsiders

6. Voluntary, involuntary, and non-termination.

Data Analysis

A generalized computer package called Statistical Analysis System (SAS) for general statistical analysis of data was used to analyze the survey data in several ways.

1. The first step was to examine the distributional characteristics of each of the variables in the study. Three statistical procedures were used to accomplish this. 1a) The FREQUENCY procedure produces one way to n-way frequency and crosstabulation. For two-way tables, PROC FREQ performs stratified analysis, computing statistics within as well as across strata. Frequencies can also be output to an SAS data set. The "Frequencies" subprogram was used to calculate the same type of descriptive statistics and to generate tabular reports of absolute and relative simple frequency distributions for use with variables that assume only a limited number of values. 1b) The SAS subprogram ANOVA procedure performs analysis of variance for balanced data from a wide variety of experimental designs. 1c) Scheffe Test for Multiple Comparisons. Comparisons were made among the three types of termination groups and among the subgroups of each variable of the questionnaire.

2. The hypotheses were tested using the Chi Square statistic technique to test for independence and homogeneity;

analysis of variance technique was appropriate as a conformity test. This technique was used for all the hypotheses except hypothesis 10, which was also done by the Scheffe technique. This test was employed to test the significance of differences of the means among groups. All the hypotheses were tested for significance at the .05 level. All analyses utilized the statistical package SAS as implemented on an IBM-3080 GX computer.

Results

The population for this study consisted of 328 Jewish day school principals and board presidents in the United States. On August 12, 1986, the questionnaires and two letters of transmittal were mailed to 328 Jewish day school principals. On September 8th a follow-up letter was sent to those who had not returned the questionnaires. Another follow-up letter was sent, hundreds of phone calls were made, and an incentive of $300 was to be awarded if all the questionnaires were returned to the writer by November 30th. At the time scheduled to begin processing the data, more than 70% of the questionnaires were returned. Twenty-two questionnaires were received too late to be processed.

The following tables show the analysis of the demographic data (see tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4).

Analysis of hypothesis 1 shows a relationship between the principals' age and the three personal reasons given for termination. Younger principals (less than 35 years old) gave

more importance to personal reasons when the reasons concerned only themselves, such as "career advancement," "increased leadership," and "prospects in new position." Older principals (more than 35 years old) gave more importance to personal reasons when the reasons concerned more than themselves, such as "family responsibilities," "expectations," and "education for children." Principals' age is not related to "health problems" or "educational philosophy" when considering a termination.

Analysis of hypothesis 2 shows that: principals from small schools indicated more negative school climate with regard to lack of equipment and supplies, limited teacher cooperation, conflict between Hebrew and secular teachers, turnover among Hebrew teachers, decrease in enrollment, and disagreement between teachers and students (see Table 2.1). Principals from small schools indicate more negative parent relations than do principals from large schools. The following reasons were found to be significantly different: parent complaints, conflicts between parents and teachers and between parents and principals (see Table 2.2). Principals from small schools and large schools differed significantly only in the following job dissatisfaction reasons: being criticized by teachers, being criticized by parents, interpersonal relations with students, and salary. No relationship was found between principals from different size schools and twelve reasons of job satisfaction (see Table 2.3).

Analysis of hypothesis 3 reveals no significant relationship between local and non-local principals and any community relations or board relations reasons given for termination (see tables 2.4 and 2.5).

Analysis of hypothesis 4 reveals three major findings, as shown in Table 3.1. e/s/h

1. No significance was found in the 5 variables given under community relations, the 6 variables under job satisfaction, and the 4 variables under school effectiveness.
2. Significance was found and principals indicated higher importance of the following 4 reasons:
   a. Opportunities for career advancement and prestigious position
   b. Family responsibilities, expectations, and education for children
   c. Prospects of additional or increased leadership and advancement in a new position
   d. Job security, tenure, and stability.
3. Significance was found and board presidents indicated higher importance on 41 reasons, as shown in Table 3.1.

The Four Most Important Reasons for Termination

Principals and board presidents were asked to write their views concerning the four most important reasons for termination. Those respondents involved in the study selected a total of more than 1000 reasons. Some participants did not select four reasons in each and every case. The responses were evaluated and divided into 20 categories. Groups of similar answers are represented by a single title. The titles were numbered 1 through 20. The four reasons written in the questionnaires were numbered and coded in the order given, indicating degree of importance.

Discussion and Conclusion

Why does a high degree of termination exist in Jewish day schools? The causal factors that have been cited as affecting termination identify some of the problems that influence principals to change their position or terminate their contracts. In discussing this issue, one may speculate that it is related to the unique system of the Jewish day school. These schools as private institutions are not governed by a national organization or by one type of leadership. Undefined instructions and regulations and involvement of board members and parents create an unstable situation in these schools. In order to reveal whether any relationship exists between the status of the principals and their termination, four hypotheses were studied and analyzed; their findings are discussed.

The termination rate for the period 1981 to 1986 was between 60 and 70%. School principals reported a termination rate of 20% for 1984-85, and board presidents reported 32.7%. This termination rate was high enough during the five-year period to make it statistically possible to replace two-thirds of the principal population. The principals' regard for or acceptance of the position as a final career goal is also an indicator of the potential termination facing the future of the position. Only 10% of the principals regarded the position as their final goal. It can be assumed that principals do not see their position as a career because upward mobility is limited in private schools.

Termination rate was found to be high and related to the following: small schools, elementary schools, small communities, principals without prior teaching experience, and incompetent principals. The termination rate was found to be equal among principals indicating similarities among the following demographic data: age, gender, degree status, school affiliation, and administrative experience.

From the research of many studies, four to six years was considered a realistic amount of time for a principal to become familiar with the philosophy of the system; to be accepted by the staff, members of boards, parents, and lay leaders of the community; and to recognize the problems of the organization, curriculum, operations, and finances. Almost two-thirds of the principals have been in their current positions for three years

or less. What could these principals have contributed to the educational programs of the school systems they served in two or three years? Professional journals and periodicals, textbooks on public school administration, and research studies of the principal's position have suggested that a number of operational policies and working conditions are considered essential for the development and maintenance of desirable outcomes in the public schools. Little research has been done regarding the private schools, and no study was found regarding the Jewish day schools. Most studies indicate that the largest group of principals is between the ages of 36 and 45. Stanfield (1982) noted that during this stage career patterns are generally clear and individual effort is put forth to become stabilized and to make a secure place for oneself in the work world. The family has been established and stability has been developed. It is during this stage that the individual's talents are put to best use in a creative and productive manner.

The current study suggests that termination is related to personal reasons and principal's age. Older principals displayed greater conservatism, tended to remain in their position, and gave more importance to personal reasons concerned with more than themselves, such as "family responsibilities" and "education for children." Younger principals gave more importance to personal reasons when the reasons concerned only themselves, such as "career advancement," "increased leadership," and "prospects in new position." The population of

this study did not reveal a tendency toward stability and a desire to remain in one place with the increase in the principal's age. Retention and stability appeared to be related to the principal's age after age 45.

Size of school and job satisfaction reasons were found to have an effect on termination. Principals from small schools and large schools differed in the following reasons: job satisfaction, school climate, parent relations, being criticized by teachers, being criticized by parents, interpersonal relations with students, lack of equipment and supplies, limited teacher cooperation, conflict between Hebrew and secular teachers, turnover among Hebrew teachers, decrease in enrollment, disagreement between teachers and students, parents' complaints, conflict between parents and teachers, and conflict between teachers and principal. These reasons appear to have a greater effect on termination because principal and subordinates have more direct contact. Principals of small schools have direct contacts with teachers, students, and parents; therefore, there is increased possibility of criticism of the principal. No relationship was found between principals' locality and relations with the community and board as reasons for termination. As was indicated, non-local principals are given a mandate for change upon employment and are the recipients of more support from the board than local principals.

In determining the relationship between principals' perception and board presidents' perception of the reasons for

termination, the following were found:

1. Principals and board presidents have the same perception regarding the following variables: community reasons, being criticized by the board, teachers, and parents; creativity of the position; lack of independence; and working conditions.
2. Principals and board presidents have different perceptions of and principals indicated higher importance on the following reasons: opportunities for career advancement and prestigious position, family responsibilities and education for children, prospect of additional or increased leadership and advancement in a new position, job security, tenure, and stability.
3. Principals and board presidents have different perceptions of the various reasons given for termination and board presidents attributed greater importance to 41 reasons (as shown in Table 3.12).

Principals and board presidents agreed on the four most important reasons for termination: financial reasons, relations with board, career and advancement, and competency. The order of the reasons given was also similar. Although no one variable seemed to be primarily responsible for principal termination, each factor seemed to contribute to a total picture in which executive termination could readily occur.

Recent studies (Dawson, 1983; Dalton, 1984) related to principals' termination revealed the following primary reasons: boards of education interfere to an excessive degree in administrative affairs and unsatisfactory board relations. These studies concluded that poor relations between the board and the principal create conflicts which impair school effectiveness.

Practically all the articles written about principal/board relations make it clear that the principal is responsible for administering the policies established by the board. The difficulty lies in defining more precisely the functions of policy-making as opposed to the functions of administrations.

Frequent terminations create considerable uncertainty in the institution. If the board changes principals, questions arise as to whether the new one will be better than the current one or as good; whether the new principal will stay and for how long; and whether he or she will be an educator or a politician. No matter what the new principal may be, a change of leadership involves many adjustments.

By developing an effective relationship between the board and the principal, the school system can work most efficiently. By recognizing the areas most likely to contribute to a breakdown in relations, the board and the principal may avoid some conflicts. Among the prime causes for potential breakdown are misunderstanding one another, failure of the principal to follow the board's policies, and failure of the board to

recognize and acknowledge the administrative role of the principal.

To promote retention, the principal must be competent in all phases of school administration and theory and be willing to utilize his/her real strength to maintain the role of educational leader. The principal must recognize the total environment and act to resolve problems before they reach a point of hostility in which political moves are no longer feasible. Principals who do not ignore the political realities of their educational environment and who take political steps to solve educational problems will become an integral part of the school system. Willingness to bargain and to compromise is extremely important in promoting principal retention, but without job security there can be no continuity of policy, no professional growth or improvement, and no peace of mind.

It has been estimated that it takes approximately five to ten years in the position for the principal to function at peak effectiveness. When a qualified principal can be assured of long-term tenure, the school has a better chance of attracting and keeping qualified teachers, and the enrollment of better-quality students is likely to increase. Therefore, a major step toward principal retention is to provide the qualified principal with a contract for at least five years, renewable annually. Such a move would tend to equalize the power differential between the school board and the principal and would encourage joint decision-making. In the long run, everybody benefits.

TABLE 1.1

School Organization

Grades	School Principals No.	%	Board Presidents No.	%
Preschool - 6th	61	27.8	25	23.6
Preschool - 8th	91	41.8	55	51.9
Preschool - 12th	24	11.0	14	13.2
9th - 12th	26	11.8	7	6.6
6th - 12th	16	7.6	4	3.7
Total	218	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE 1.2
Student Enrollment

Number of Students in School	School Size	School Principals No.	%	Board Presidents No.	%
Fewer than 50	Small	17	7.8	11	10.4
51 - 100		50	22.8	18	17.0
101 - 150	Medium	25	11.4	17	16.0
151 - 200		21	9.6	15	14.1
201 - 250		18	8.2	18	17.0
More than 250	Large	87	40.2	26	25.5
Total		218	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE 1.3
Gender Distribution

Gender	School Principals No.	%	Board Presidents No.	%
Female	62	28.4	29	27.6
Male	156	71.6	76	72.4
Total	218	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE 1.4

Age Distribution

Age Group	School Principals No.	%	Board Presidents No.	%
25 or under	1	.5	--	--
26 - 35	41	18.8	13	12.4
36 - 45	105	48.2	54	51.4
46 - 55	50	22.9	31	29.5
56 and over	21	9.6	7	6.7
Total	218	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE 2.1

Crosstabulation of School Size and School Climate Reasons Given for Termination by School Principals

School Climate Reasons	Scale Range	School Size: Small Schools Frequency	Small Schools Deviation	Large Schools Frequency	Large Schools Deviation	Probability
Unable to implement new ideas	Low	23	1.0	52	-1.0	.664
	High	11	-1.0	30	1.0	
Discipline problems	Low	34	0.9	79	-0.9	.258
	High	0	-0.9	3	0.9	
Excessive work	Low	22	-3.5	65	3.5	.099
	High	12	3.5	17	-3.5	
Lack of equipment and supplies	Low	27	-3.2	76	3.2	.039*
	High	7	3.2	6	-3.2	
Limited teacher cooperation	Low	23	-5.7	74	5.7	.001*
	High	11	5.7	7	-5.7	
Conflict between Hebrew and secular teachers	Low	27	-3.4	75	3.4	.022*
	High	7	3.4	5	-3.4	
Turnover among Hebrew teachers	Low	24	-4.7	73	4.7	.009*
	High	10	4.7	8	-4.7	
Turnover among secular teachers	Low	32	-0.5	77	0.5	.611
	High	2	0.5	3	-0.5	
Decrease in enrollment	Low	25	-4.3	74	4.3	.012*
	High	9	4.3	7	-4.3	
Disagreement between teachers and students	Low	30	-2.2	79	2.2	.041*
	High	4	2.2	2	-2.2	

* significant

TABLE 2.2

Crosstabulation of School Size and Parent Relations Reasons Given for Termination by School Principals

Parent Relations Reasons	Scale Range	School Size: Small Schools Frequency	Small Schools Deviation	Large Schools Frequency	Large Schools Deviation	Probability
Parents' complaints	Low	21	-7.3	74	7.3	.000*
	High	13	7.3	6	-7.3	
Conflicts between parents and teachers	Low	26	-4.4	76	4.4	.003*
	High	8	4.4	4	-4.4	
Conflicts between parents and principal	Low	25	-3.9	71	3.9	.026*
	High	9	3.9	8	-3.9	
Parents' control of school	Low	22	-1.1	57	1.1	.629
	High	11	1.1	23	-1.1	
Parental pressures	Low	20	-2.9	61	2.9	.173
	High	12	2.9	20	-2.9	

* significant

TABLE 2.3

Crosstabulation of School Size and Job Satisfaction Factors Given by School Principals

Job Satisfaction Reasons	Scale Range	School Size: Small Schools Frequency	Small Schools Deviation	Large Schools Frequency	Large Schools Deviation	Probability
Advancement	Low	15	-4.1	48	4.1	.105
	High	21	4.1	35	-4.1	
Job security	Low	14	-3.8	47	3.8	.128
	High	21	3.8	38	-3.8	
Criticized by board	Low	24	-1.7	61	1.7	.449
	High	12	1.7	22	-1.7	
Criticized by teachers	Low	24	-4.7	71	4.7	.018*
	High	12	4.7	12	-4.7	
Criticized by parents	Low	21	-4.7	64	4.7	.037*
	High	15	4.7	19	-4.7	
Managerial role	Low	25	-2.8	68	2.8	.216
	High	13	2.8	21	-2.8	
Creative position	Low	29	-1.5	72	1.5	.477
	High	9	1.5	16	-1.5	
Lack of independence	Low	28	-1.0	68	1.0	.664
	High	10	1.0	20	-1.0	
Working conditions	Low	17	-3.0	50	3.0	.237
	High	21	3.0	39	-3.0	
Board relations	Low	25	-3.3	70	3.3	.121
	High	12	3.3	17	-3.3	
Parent relations	Low	30	-1.0	74	1.0	.582
	High	7	1.0	13	-1.0	
Teacher relations	Low	32	-2.0	82	2.0	.146
	High	5	2.0	5	-2.0	
Student relations	Low	34	-1.8	84	1.8	.048*
	High	3	1.8	1	-1.8	
Personal life	Low	19	-3.4	56	3.4	.175
	High	18	3.4	31	-3.4	
Salary	Low	18	-5.0	59	5.0	.044*
	High	19	5.0	28	-5.0	

* significant

TABLE 2.4

Crosstabulation of Principals' Locality and Community Relations Reasons Given for Termination by School Principals

Community Relations Reasons	Scale Range	Principals' Locality: Local Frequency	Local Deviation	Non-Local Frequency	Non-Local Deviation	Probability
Conflicts between board and principal	Low	18	0.8	71	-0.8	.810
	High	4	-0.8	20	0.8	
High teacher turnover	Low	20	1.2	77	-1.2	.689
	High	2	-1.2	14	1.2	
Conflicts between principal and teachers	Low	20	0.4	81	-0.4	.911
	High	2	-0.4	10	0.4	
High principal turnover	Low	18	0.9	74	-0.9	.801
	High	3	-0.9	17	0.9	
Decrease in enrollment	Low	19	1.0	74	-1.0	.769
	High	3	-1.0	17	1.0	

TABLE 2.5

Crosstabulation of Principals' Locality and
Board Relations Reasons
Given for Termination by School Principals

Board Relations Reasons	Scale Range	Principals' Locality: Local Frequency	Local Deviation	Non-Local Frequency	Non-Local Deviation	Probability
Educational conflicts	Low	16	2.2	59	-2.2	.475
	High	5	-2.2	32	2.2	
Board support	Low	16	0.9	65	-0.9	.777
	High	5	-0.9	25	0.9	
Disagreement between board and principal	Low	16	2.3	56	-2.3	.465
	High	6	-2.3	35	2.3	
Involvement in policy	Low	18	0.6	72	-0.6	.846
	High	4	-0.6	19	0.6	
Freedom in school's operation	Low	17	2.1	61	-2.1	.517
	High	5	-2.1	30	2.1	

Table 3.1 a/b/c

Crosstabulation of Principals' and Board Presidents' Perceptions
of the Importance of Each Variable as Reasons for Termination

a. Personal Reasons	Scale Range	Principals Frequency	Principals Deviation	Board Presidents Frequency	Board Presidents Deviation	Probability
Career and advancement	Low	62	-17.4	43	17.4	.000*
	High	162	17.4	36	-17.4	
Health problems	Low	209	1.1	77	-1.1	.350
	High	4	-1.1	3	1.1	
Family responsibility	Low	76	-17.8	53	17.8	.000*
	High	137	17.8	27	-17.8	
Prospects in the new position	Low	52	-20.7	48	20.7	.000*
	High	161	20.7	32	-20.7	
Educational philosophy	Low	161	1.5	57	-1.5	.643
	High	49	-1.5	20	1.5	
b. Financial Reasons						
Dissatisfaction with salary	Low	182	11.5	52	-11.5	.000*
	High	33	-11.5	28	11.5	
Difficulties in negotiations	Low	172	7.5	54	-7.5	.020*
	High	42	-7.5	26	7.5	
Lack of financial support	Low	182	-0.2	68	0.2	.941
	High	33	0.2	12	0.2	
Difficulties living on salary	Low	184	7.6	58	-7.6	.009*
	High	31	-7.6	22	7.6	
Lack of fringe benefits	Low	184	7.6	58	-7.6	.009*
	High	31	-7.6	22	7.6	
c. Board Relations Reasons						
Educational conflicts	Low	175	7.1	57	-7.1	.022*
	High	37	-7.1	24	7.1	
Board support	Low	181	17.7	45	-17.7	.000*
	High	30	-17.7	36	17.7	
Disagreement between board and principal	Low	172	12.6	48	-12.6	.000*
	High	41	-12.6	33	12.6	
Involvement in policy	Low	190	6.0	64	-6.0	.023*
	High	23	-6.0	17	6.0	
Freedom in school's operation	Low	178	7.9	56	-7.9	.010*
	High	35	-7.9	24	7.9	

* significant

Table 3.1 d/e

Crosstabulation of Principals' and Board Presidents' Perceptions of the Importance of Each Variable as Reasons for Termination

d. School Climate	Scale Range	Principals Frequency	Principals Deviation	Board Presidents Frequency	Board Presidents Deviation	Probability
Inability to implement new ideas	Low	174	-0.2	65	0.2	.950
	High	41	0.2	15	0.2	
Discipline problems	Low	212	5.0	73	-5.0	.001*
	High	3	-5.0	8	5.0	
Excessive work	Low	186	10.9	55	-10.9	.000*
	High	29	-10.9	26	10.9	
Lack of equipment and supplies	Low	202	3.0	72	-3.0	.139
	High	13	-3.0	9	3.0	
Limited teacher cooperation	Low	196	8.1	63	-8.1	.001*
	High	18	-8.1	18	8.1	
Conflict between Hebrew and secular teachers	Low	201	3.9	71	-3.9	.041*
	High	12	-3.9	10	3.9	
Turnover among Hebrew teachers	Low	196	4.5	68	-4.5	.046*
	High	18	-4.5	13	4.5	
Turnover among secular teachers	Low	208	4.4	73	-4.4	.005*
	High	5	-4.4	8	4.4	
Decrease in enrollment	Low	198	7.9	64	-7.9	.001*
	High	16	-7.9	17	7.9	
Disagreement between teachers and students	Low	208	5.6	71	-5.6	.001*
	High	6	-5.6	10	5.6	
e. Community Relations Reasons						
Conflicts between board and principal	Low	189	3.6	66	-3.6	.157
	High	24	-3.6	14	3.6	
High teacher turnover	Low	197	2.8	71	-2.8	.192
	High	16	-2.8	10	2.8	
Conflicts between principal & teachers	Low	201	2.5	73	-2.5	.197
	High	12	-2.5	8	2.5	
High principal turnover	Low	192	3.9	68	-3.9	.109
	High	20	-3.9	13	3.9	
Decrease in enrollment	Low	193	3.9	68	-3.9	.106
	High	20	-3.9	13	3.9	

* significant

Table 3.1 f

Crosstabulation of Principals' and Board Presidents' Perceptions of the Importance of Each Variable as Reasons for Termination

f. Parent Relations Reasons	Scale Range	Principals Frequency	Principals Deviation	Board Presidents Frequency	Board Presidents Deviation	Probability
Parents' complaints	Low	194	17.3	49	-17.3	.000*
	High	19	-17.3	31	17.3	
Conflicts between parents & teachers	Low	201	7.6	65	-7.6	.001*
	High	12	-7.6	15	7.6	
Conflicts between parents & principal	Low	195	17.8	49	-17.8	.000*
	High	17	-17.8	31	17.8	
Parents control school	Low	178	5.9	59	-5.9	.047*
	High	34	-5.9	21	5.9	
Parental pressures	Low	180	5.3	59	-5.3	.066
	High	32	-5.3	19	5.3	

* significant

Table 3.1 g

Crosstabulation of Principals' and Board Presidents' Perceptions of the Importance of Each Factor of Job Satisfaction

g. Job Satisfaction Factors	Scale Range	Principals Frequency	Principals Deviation	Board Presidents Frequency	Board Presidents Deviation	Probability
Advancement	Low	162	15.9	37	-15.9	.000*
	High	56	-15.9	42	15.9	
Job security	Low	61	-23.2	54	23.2	.000*
	High	158	23.2	26	-23.2	
Criticized by board	Low	85	3.3	51	-3.3	.307
	High	34	-3.3	28	3.3	
Criticized by teachers	Low	95	3.6	57	-3.6	.210
	High	24	-3.6	22	3.6	
Criticized by parents	Low	85	3.6	49	3.6	.252
	High	34	3.6	28	3.6	
Managerial role	Low	192	12.8	53	-12.8	.000*
	High	34	-12.8	30	12.8	
Creative position	Low	200	3.6	68	-3.6	.165
	High	25	-3.6	14	3.6	
Lack of independence	Low	195	3.7	66	-3.7	.180
	High	30	-3.7	16	3.7	
Working conditions	Low	166	4.6	54	-4.6	.192
	High	60	-4.6	28	4.6	
Relations with board	Low	194	14.1	52	-14.1	.000*
	High	29	-14.1	30	14.1	
Relations with parents	Low	203	12.9	57	-12.9	.000*
	High	20	-12.9	25	12.9	
Relations with teachers	Low	213	9.0	66	-9.0	.000*
	High	10	-9.0	16	9.0	
Relations with students	Low	217	4.0	74	-4.0	.005*
	High	4	-4.0	7	4.0	
Personal life	Low	174	7.5	53	-7.5	.026*
	High	49	-7.5	28	7.5	
Salary	Low	176	12.2	48	-12.2	.000*
	High	47	-12.2	34	12.2	

* significant

Table 3.1 h

Crosstabulation of Principals' and Board Presidents' Perceptions of the Importance of Each Variable as Reasons for Termination

h. School Effectiveness Reasons	Scale Range	Principals Frequency	Principals Deviation	Board Presidents Frequency	Board Presidents Deviation	Probability
Classroom discipline	Low	88	5.6	47	-5.6	.097
	High	39	-5.6	34	5.6	
Interaction between teachers and students	Low	60	5.0	31	-5.0	.157
	High	67	-5.0	52	5.0	
Identification with school philosophy	Low	86	11.6	37	-11.6	.001*
	High	41	-11.6	46	11.6	
Develop personality	Low	70	3.2	40	-3.2	.370
	High	57	-3.2	42	3.2	
School achieves its goals	Low	72	5.9	38	-5.9	.095
	High	53	-5.9	45	5.9	
School academic goals	Low	56	4.9	29	-4.9	.157
	High	69	-4.9	54	4.9	
Is school a pleasant place	Low	53	16.3	8	-16.3	.000*
	High	74	-16.3	76	16.3	
Renovation of curriculum	Low	99	3.0	62	-3.0	.314
	High	22	3.0	19	3.0	
Effect on performance	Low	30	-9.0	35	9.0	.006*
	High	93	9.0	47	-9.0	
Educational innovation	Low	45	-2.2	36	2.2	.382
	High	71	2.2	46	2.2	
Student achievement	Low	48	-6.8	42	6.8	.048*
	High	75	6.8	37	-6.8	
Curriculum	Low	28	-9.9	34	-9.9	.002*
	High	96	9.9	45	9.9	
Student enrollment	Low	44	-3.0	33	3.0	.368
	High	80	3.0	46	-3.0	
Teacher turnover	Low	67	-2.4	47	2.4	.482
	High	56	2.4	32	-2.4	
School climate	Low	13	-9.5	24	9.5	.000*
	High	110	9.5	55	-9.5	

* significant

REFERENCES

Bentley, Donald W., "A Study of Variables Related to Turnover of Superintendents in Selected North Carolina School Systems," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Carolina University, 1976.

Brause, Dorsey W., "Identification of Major Factors Affecting the Demands of School Superintendents," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois State University, 1968.

Brown, M. C., "Administrative succession and organizational performance: The succession effect," Administrative Science Quarterly, 27 (1982) 1-16.

Burlingame, Martin, "An exploratory study of turnover and career mobility in the State of Illinois from 1960-1970," paper prepared for the Select Study Committee on School District Organization, State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, Ed. 152462, August 1977, 63 pp.

Castagna, Joseph Peter, "Mobility Among Public Elementary School Principals of Connecticut from 1953 through 1961," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1963.

Dalton, Steve, "A Study of Superintendent Turnover in North Carolina (1980-1982)," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1984.

Dawson, Lee Elizabeth, "Factors Related to Continuation and Non-Continuation of Superintendents in Region Study Group VI of the Commonwealth of Virginia," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Ed.D. 1983, 168 pp.

Flatto, Zehava, "Role congruency and job satisfaction of principals in Jewish day schools," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York, 1978.

Graser, Daniel J., "A Study of Turnover in the Position of Superintendent in New Jersey Public School Districts as a Function of Expected Performance," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, January 1972, p. 88.

Lutz, Robert George, "Factors Associated with Short Tenure of School Superintendents in Michigan," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963. Dissertation Abstracts, 24/02, 590-1.

Miskel, Cecil and Owens, Melva, "Principal Succession and Changes in School Coupling and Effectiveness," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983, 36 pp.

Paolillo, Vincent Joseph, "A Study of Missouri School District Superintendent Mobility," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, Ed.D. 1982, 147 pp.

Schiff, Alvin I., "The Jewish Day Schools in the United States," in Encyclopedia Judaica, 1974 yearbook.

Stanfield, Ronald Max, "Career Mobility Patterns of Elementary School Principals in the State of Utah," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The State University of Utah, Ed.D. 1982, 230 pp.